

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1–30. Claims 2–5, 10, 12, 15–24, and 29 are being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 6, 9, 11, 25, 26, 28, and 30 are being amended to further recite the features of the invention. As a result, claims 1, 6–9, 11, 13, 14, 25–28, and 30 are pending for examination with claims 1, 6, and 25 being independent claims. The amendments made find support in the specification and do not constitute new matter.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1–30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Canon Kabushiki Kaisha (European Patent Application EP1205843A) (“Canon”). Applicants have amended the claims to further recite the invention thus making the Examiner’s rejection moot.

In particular and among other things, Applicants have amended claim 1 to call for:

“...a first asynchronous communications channel established between the client print spooler and the server print spooler; and ...a second asynchronous communications channel established between the server and the client, **the second asynchronous communications channel being distinct from the first asynchronous communications channel,**...”

(underlining and bolding added for emphasis)

Amendment

Application Number: 10/804,619

Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01

and Applicants have similarly amended claim 6 to call for:

“...a first asynchronous communications channel, ... a second asynchronous communications channel..., **the second asynchronous communications channel being distinct from the first asynchronous communications channel**.” (underlining and bolding added for emphasis)

and Applicants have similarly amended claim 25 to call for:

“...a first communications channel, ...a second communications channel, **the second communications channel being distinct from the first communications channel**,...” (underlining and bolding added for emphasis)

As such, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 6, and 25 are not anticipated by Canon under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

In support of these amendments, the original specification provides:

“...the word processing program initiates a print request 160 which is communicated to the print spooler 114 residing on a client computer. The print spooler receives data from the applications program

Amendment
Application Number: 10/804,619
Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01

for transmission to the print server. In one embodiment **this data is transmitted by means of an asynchronous remote procedure call (RPC) between the client and the server.** ... the user interface manager 130 sets up 170 an asynchronous notify channel 132 to the print server for inter-process communications independent of the print request from the client print spooler to the server print spooler. ... **This channel is separate and distinct from the RPC communications between the two print spoolers regarding progress of the applications programs print request.**" (portions pg. 8, lines 9–30; underlining and bolding added for emphasis)

Please also see FIGs. 3 and 5A which further support the amendments. FIG. 3 makes clear the two distinct communications channels, one labeled "PRINT REQUEST" (also labeled "PRINT 160" in FIG. 5A), and the other labeled "BI-DIRECTION ASYNC CHANNEL 132".

Canon, on the other hand, does not disclose, teach, or suggest a first communications channel for sending print data between a client print spooler and a server print spooler as well as a second distinct communications channel for sending language-neutral messages between the server and the client.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 6, and 25 are not anticipated by Canon under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Claims 7–9, 11, 13, 14, 26–28, and 30 are dependent on at least one of claims 1, 6, and 25. As such, claims 7–9, 11, 13, 14, 26–28, and 30 are believed allowable at least in part based upon claim 1, 6, or 25.

Amendment
Application Number: 10/804,619
Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01

Accordingly, reconsideration and examination of the above-referenced application is requested.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment
Application Number: 10/804,619
Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01

AMENDMENT

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: 10-31-2007

By: /L. Alan Collins/

L. Alan Collins, Reg. No.: 57,646
Direct telephone (425) 703-8265
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

Amendment

Application Number: 10/804,619

Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01